

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the consideration shown by the Office as evidenced by the Office Action mailed on November 1, 2007. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 9-32, and objected to claims 11 and 12. In this Response, Applicants have amended claim 11. Claims 1-6, and 9-32 remain pending in this application. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

1. Claim Objections

Applicants have amended claim 11 in accordance with the Examiner's objection, and believe that this amendment fully addresses the objection to claims 11 and 12. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

2. Claim Rejections—35 USC §102

Claims 1-3, 6, 9-10, 13-19, and 24-31 were rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Jackson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,287,644, hereinafter "Jackson"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Anticipation requires disclosure of each and every claim limitation in a single prior art reference, either explicitly or inherently. Here, Jackson fails to disclose the recited steps (instant claim 1, for example) of "coating said substrate with a metal layer, the metal layer comprising at least one metal selected from the group consisting of platinum and palladium" and "depositing a protective coating onto said metal layer using said target in an ion plasma deposition process."

In sharp contrast to the recitation in present claim 1, where at least two distinct metallic layers are deposited over the substrate, there is no mention or even a suggestion in Jackson that more than one metallic coating be applied to the substrate to form the bondcoat. In fact, Jackson discloses a method that is limited to production of a single, continuously graded coating: "[O]nce deposition is initiated it continues until all evaporated materials are deposited. Thus, there are no discontinuities, step-wise changes, or breaks in the continuously graded bondcoat 105." Col. 8, lines 25-29. The two steps,

recited in claim 1 and other independent claims of the present application, of first depositing a metal layer comprising platinum or palladium and then depositing another metallic layer over the former layer, are not taught, suggested, or disclosed in Jackson. Indeed, the whole point of Jackson's process is to avoid discrete, multiple layers.

Jackson fails to teach all limitations recited by claim 1, its dependent claims, and independent claim 32. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentably distinct from Jackson.

3. Claim Rejections—35 USC §103

The Examiner rejected a number of claims dependent from claim 1 under Section 103, using Jackson as the primary reference, combined with various other references. However, as pointed out above, Applicants believe that claim 1 is allowable over Jackson, and thus the dependent claims rejected under Section 103 should be allowable due to their dependency from an allowable independent claim. Applicants respectfully request removal of these rejections.

4. Conclusion

In light of the remarks and amendments presented herein, Applicants believe that this serves as a complete response to the subject Office Action. If, however, any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Paul J. DiConza/

Paul DiConza

Reg. No. 48,418

General Electric Company

Building K1, Room 3A60

Telephone: (518) 387-6131

Niskayuna, New York
Thursday, February 07, 2008